Production
5g

5   JUN 1974

DD/S&T#*2214/74*

3 JUN 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DCI

SUBJECT: Revamping the KIQ Evaluation Process

Recently you have been hearing a lot of complaints about the KIQ's
and the KIQ evaluation process, and I would guess that it is sometimes
difficult for you to distinguish whether the criticisms go to the KIQ
concept itself or only to the paper work that has grown up around the
KIQ Evaluation Process. I personally consider the KIQ's to be a very
useful and important innovation and I think you should feel comfortable
that most people recognize the importance of having for the first time
a list of the questions which the DCI considers to be of highest
priority. Likewise, I think you should feel content that many benefits
can accrue from some kind of a procedure which would use the KIQ's as
a focus for periodic review of collection system performance. I there-
fore encourage you to concern yourself only with revising the procedures
which have been established to perform the KIQ evaluations; these have,
I believe, been formalized to the point where they endanger the true
value of the evaluations.

It seems to me that the great benefit that can result from the
KIQ evaluation process is a discipline which will force the production
office managers and their next level supervisors to periodically ask
themselves how well the collectors are doing against Key Intelligence
Questions and to report their impressions about this to you. If these
individuals personally review this question, say, every six months,
that action in itself would stimulate analysts all down the line to
take on as part of their daily activities the function of evaluating
their sources of information as they receive the data. This would
provide you with a constant base of information and a source of critique
from which your NIO's can draw whenever a specific value judgment must
be made; and it will inevitably promote a continuing dialogue between
users and collectors about the utility of the collector's product.
This is a very practical, worthwhile and, I believe, sufficient benefit
that you can hope to get from a properly constructed KIQ evaluation
process.

The question is then, how to arrange that process in a way which
will force the personal attention of the production office managers and
their next level supervisors on the issues. I do not think you can

attain this result from the kind of formalized procedures that have so far been attempted. Indeed, I think these will only bring the process to the level of other routine reporting and will cause the very people whom you want to be involved to give only lip service to the process.

I propose instead the following. In the past I have heard you speak of your hope that KIQ evaluations could be made on one or two pages. I suggest that you insist on that, and rather than ask your IC Staff to administer the process, you go directly to the managers of the production offices around the community and require that each office manager and each of their next level supervisors prepare a one or two page evaluation for each KIQ, that they write it out in their personal hand, and that they compose it only after a face-to-face review with their next level subordinates on each Key Intelligence Question. I suggest that you require all of these individuals to have such a hand written evaluation in your office on the first of January and the first of July of each year. If possible, it would be useful for you to follow the receipt of these evaluations with a series of meetings at which these managers would personally summarize their evaluations for you.

It may seem peculiar to you that I specify that the evaluations be submitted in the hand of the submitting officer, but I believe that this is the only way that you can prevent the procedure from devolving into an evaluation written primarily by staff people and typed out for the boss to sign. As such it would probably be prepared without the full participation of the manager whose personal attention and experience you are trying to involve.

I would also prohibit anyone from trying to collate these opinions after they are submitted in an attempt to provide some comprehensive evaluation of the full array of collection resources. I think such a collation would not only be misleading (since the data base is too narrow, being derived from only the high priority KIQ's) but would inevitably put pressure on those submitting the reports for adherence to a more and more structured and formalized evaluation (with no doubt an end objective of getting results into a computer). Your purposes will be well served if you will insist on a process that has the single objective of forcing the attention of your intelligence production managers on the question of collection system performance against the Key Intelligence Questions. The specific answers that come out of such a review are much less important, I believe, than the fact that the review is regularly taking place.

25X

Donald H. Steininger

cc: Mr. Duckett
    Dr. Proctor

5X1

Mr. Carver
Gen. Graham

UNCLASSIFIED | CONFIDENTIAL | SECRET

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	General Graham		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	

Remarks:

OK. except that while
Bill can get hand-written
evaluation from DIA + OSD-NT,
he can't from DIA, TNK,
etc.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
Donald H. Steininger	3 June 74

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET

FORM NO. 237   Use previous editions   (40)
1-67

5   JUN 1974   IC REGISTRY ROUTING SLIP

OFFICE	INITIALS	DATE		OFFICE	INITIALS	DATE
LIG Graham			3	MPRRG		
Dr.Clarke			3	PRG		
SP ASST				CPAG		
Exec Off				USIB SEC		
CS				IHC		
ICS Registry						

ACTION REQUIRED AND ASSIGNED TO: _____

SUSPENSE DATE: _____

INFORMATION ONLY _____

IC Rec   cys.   Cys furn: Gen Graham _____ Dr. Clarke _____ CS _____ MPRRG _____
PRG _____ CPAG _____ USIB _____ IHC _____

REMARKS:

2-3 Have a look ?

IC REGISTRY ROUTING SLIP

Production
59 Ktos

	OFFICE	INITIALS	DATE		OFFICE	INITIALS	DATE
2	LTG Graham			3	MPRRG		
X1				4	PRG		
	SP ASST				CPAG		
	Exec Off				USIB SEC		
	CS				IHC		
	ICS Registry						

ACTION REQUIRED AND ASSIGNED TO: _____	SUSPENSE DATE: _____	INFORMATION ONLY _____

IC Rec ___ cys. Cys furn: Gen Graham _____ Dr. Clarke _____ CS _____ MPRRG _____
PRG _____ CPAG _____ USIB _____ IHC _____

REMARKS:

Routing Slip

TO:

		ACTION	INFO.			ACTION	INFO.
1	DCI			11	LC		
2	DDCI			12	IG		
3	S/MC			13	Compt		
4	DDS&T			14	Asst/DCI		
5	DDI			15	AO/DCI		
6	DDM&S			16	Ex/Sec		
7	DDO			17			
8	D/DCI/IC						
9	D/DCI/NIO						
10	GC						

X1

SUSPENSE _____
Date

Remarks:

Some interesting points —

DCI/DDCI
6/10/74

Noted by DCI
6/10/74

8 JUN 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DCI

SUBJECT: Revamping the KIQ Evaluation Process

        Recently you have been hearing a lot of complaints about the KIQ's
and the KIQ evaluation process, and I would guess that it is sometimes
difficult for you to distinguish whether the criticisms go to the KIQ
concept itself or only to the paper work that has grown up around the
KIQ Evaluation Process. I personally consider the KIQ's to be a very
useful and important innovation and I think you should feel comfortable
that most people recognize the importance of having for the first time
a list of the questions which the DCI considers to be of highest
priority. Likewise, I think you should feel content that many benefits
can accrue from some kind of a procedure which would use the KIQ's as
a focus for periodic review of collection system performance. I there-
fore encourage you to concern yourself only with revising the procedures
which have been established to perform the KIQ evaluations; these have,
I believe, been formalized to the point where they endanger the true
value of the evaluations.

        It seems to me that the great benefit that can result from the
KIQ evaluation process is a discipline which will force the production
office managers and their next level supervisors to periodically ask
themselves how well the collectors are doing against Key Intelligence
Questions and to report their impressions about this to you. If these
individuals personally review this question, say, every six months,
that action in itself would stimulate analysts all down the line to
take on as part of their daily activities the function of evaluating
their sources of information as they receive the data. This would
provide you with a constant base of information and a source of critique
from which your NIO's can draw whenever a specific value judgment must
be made; and it will inevitably promote a continuing dialogue between
users and collectors about the utility of the collector's product.
This is a very practical, worthwhile and, I believe, sufficient benefit
that you can hope to get from a properly constructed KIQ evaluation
process.

        The question is then, how to arrange that process in a way which
will force the personal attention of the production office managers and
their next level supervisors on the issues. I do not think you can

attain this result from the kind of formalized procedures that have so far been attempted. Indeed, I think these will only bring the process to the level of other routine reporting and will cause the very people whom you want to be involved to give only lip service to the process.

I propose instead the following. In the past I have heard you speak of your hope that KIQ evaluations could be made on one or two pages. I suggest that you insist on that, and rather than ask your IC Staff to administer the process, you go directly to the managers of the production offices around the community and require that each office manager and each of their next level supervisors prepare a one or two page evaluation for each KIQ, that they write it out in their personal hand, and that they compose it only after a face-to-face review with their next level subordinates on each Key Intelligence Question. I suggest that you require all of these individuals to have such a hand written evaluation in your office on the first of January and the first of July of each year. If possible, it would be useful for you to follow the receipt of these evaluations with a series of meetings at which these managers would personally summarize their evaluations for you.

It may seem peculiar to you that I specify that the evaluations be submitted in the hand of the submitting officer, but I believe that this is the only way that you can prevent the procedure from devolving into an evaluation written primarily by staff people and typed out for the boss to sign. As such it would probably be prepared without the full participation of the manager whose personal attention and experience you are trying to involve.

I would also prohibit anyone from trying to collate these opinions after they are submitted in an attempt to provide some comprehensive evaluation of the full array of collection resources. I think such a collation would not only be misleading (since the data base is too narrow, being derived from only the high priority KIQ's) but would inevitably put pressure on those submitting the reports for adherence to a more and more structured and formalized evaluation (with no doubt an end objective of getting results into a computer). Your purposes will be well served if you will insist on a process that has the single objective of forcing the attention of your intelligence production managers on the question of collection system performance against the Key Intelligence Questions. The specific answers that come out of such a review are much less important, I believe, than the fact that the review is regularly taking place.

Donald H. Steininger

25X

cc: Mr. Duckett
Dr. Proctor

Mr. Carver
Gen. Graham